

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 15-17, and 20-26 are pending. Claims 18-19 are canceled. Claims 1, 15, and 17 are amended. The remaining claims are unchanged.

The claim amendments are supported by the application as originally filed, for example, in paragraph [0176] of the published application, Pub No. 2003/0018808. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 17, 18, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Bakshi et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2009/0019534) (hereinafter “Bakshi”).

It is respectfully submitted that claims 17, 18, and 21 are not anticipated for at least the following reasons.

Bakshi relates to techniques for providing unified authentication services in an ASP setting to a user to access requested information. (Abstract). End-users may register their credentials once with a user-management component. (Abstract). For example, a user may be redirected by a web/application server to the system described in Bakshi so that the user may provide the credentials required by the web/application server. (¶ [0114]). The user management component 207 maintains a central data center that stores and manages user credentials. (¶ [0115]). Thus, a user may authenticate once with the authentication server and then may be authenticated to potentially unrelated online accounts provided by different web/application servers. (¶ [0154]-[0161]).

In contrast to Bakshi, the independent claims recite transmitting a message relating to an enterprise between two different service providers that are each independent of the enterprise. An identifier is associated with the enterprise by the message routing network, and a service provider receiving a message including the identifier need only be provided with authentication of the message routing network to authenticate the service provider that sent the message.

By way of example, claim 17 is directed to a method for authenticating services participating in routing of a message in a message routing network. Claim 17 has been amended to recite:

before the routing of the message in the message routing network:

(a) authenticating an enterprise to the message routing network;

(b) **associating an identifier with the enterprise**, the identifier provided by the message routing network responsive to authentication of the enterprise to the message routing network, the

identifier indicating authentication of the enterprise to the message routing network;

(c) authenticating the enterprise to a first service provider;

(d) associating the identifier with an account of the enterprise at the first service provider responsive to the enterprise being authenticated to the first service provider, such that the identifier further indicates authentication of the enterprise to the enterprise account at the first service provider;

such that when a **message including said identifier is received by a second service provider from the first service provider**, authentication of only said message routing network using the identifier included in the message provides authentication of the first service provider, **wherein the first and second service providers are each independent of the enterprise.**

(Emphasis Added).

Claim 17 has been amended to clarify that the message that includes the identifier associated with the enterprise is transmitted between “first and second service providers [that] are each independent of the enterprise.” Thus, as recited in newly amended claim 17, the “message including said identifier is received by a second service provider from the first service provider.” Further, “when a message including said identifier is received by a second service provider from the first service provider, authentication of only said message routing network using the identifier included in the message provides authentication of the first service provider.”

Bakshi fails to disclose or suggest authentication of only the message routing network to a receiver a message transmitted between two different service providers that are each independent of the enterprise, as recited in claim 17. In contrast, Bakshi describes communication between a user and one or more web applications. For instance, Bakshi teaches that a user may be authenticated “to Internet-accessible (or web) applications and/or services that manage . . . confidential information.” (§ [0051]). There is no disclosure or suggestion in Bakshi that these web applications communicate with each other. For instance, in reference to Figure 1, Bakshi does not describe sending a message relating to one of the Clients between two different Servers. In contrast, Bakshi states: “It is important to note that each of these web applications may potentially not know the other applications exist.” (§ [0120]).

Since the Web applications described in Bakshi do not communicate with each other, Bakshi fails to disclose or suggest a message that includes an identifier related to an enterprise and that is transmitted between two service providers that are each independent of the enterprise. Further, since Bakshi fails to disclose or suggest transmitting any such message, Bakshi also fails to disclose or suggest that the sender of the message (e.g., the first service provider) can be

authenticated to the receiver of such a message (e.g., the second service provider) by authentication of only the message routing network using an identifier included in the message (e.g., the identifier associated with the enterprise).

Thus, claim 17 recites features that are not disclosed or suggested in Bakshi. Therefore, claim 17 is not anticipated by Bakshi.

Claim 21 is a dependent claim which include, by virtue of its dependency, the features of claim 17. Thus, claim 21 is not anticipated for at least the reasons set forth above.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of Bakshi and U.S. Patent No. 6,704,768 (hereinafter “Zombek”). Claims 1-3 and 5-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of Bakshi, Zombek, and U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2001/0005358 (hereinafter “Shiozawa”). Claims 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0243574 (hereinafter “Giroux”), Bakshi, and Zombek. Claims 22-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of Bakshi and U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2008/0052775 (hereinafter “Sandhu”).

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-3, 5-8, 15-16, 19-20, and 21-26 are not obvious for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1 and 15 have been amended to recite features similar to those recited in claim 17. As discussed herein, Bakshi fails to disclose or suggest several features recited in claim 17 as amended.

As discussed in the Response filed on August 31, 2009, Zombek fails to disclose or suggest providing authentication of only the message routing network using an identifier as defined in the independent claims. In contrast, Zombek describes authorization using an individual device address of a device associated with the message. Additionally, Zombek makes no mention of any authentication performed of the message routing network to the receiver of the message. Instead, Zombek states that “the MR 124 can be responsible for determining that the sender of a message is an authorized customer of the intelligent messaging network.” (Col. 21, lines 32-34). Nowhere does Zombek disclose or suggest that the receiver of a message is provided with authentication of the network. Therefore, Zombek fails to disclose or suggest that authentication of only said message routing network using the identifier included in the message provides authentication of the sender of the message.

Shiozawa describes a packet protection method allowing rapid restoration in case of fault occurrence. (Abstract). For instance, when a failure occurs during transmission of a packet, the packet is returned to the start-point router. (¶ [0074]). Thus, Shiozawa relates to low level network management issues such as packet routing. (See, e.g., Figs. 3 and 4; ¶ [0001]-[0004]; and [0009]). Shiozawa does not describe messaging between service providers, authentication of an enterprise or of a service provider, or authentication of a message routing network using an identifier included in the message. Therefore, Shiozawa fails to disclose or suggest the same features lacking in Bakshi and Zombek.

Giroux describes techniques for replicating data on a source to a destination. (Abstract). Data is extracted from a source in a source format, converted to a destination format, and uploaded at the destination. (Abstract). The source and destination may be, for example, ASPs connected to the internet. (¶ [0006]). However, Giroux is not cited in the Office Action as disclosing or suggesting any authentication operations. Indeed, the Office Action states: “Giroux did not specifically teach authentication.” (Office Action, page 10, lines 12-13). Therefore, Giroux fails to disclose or suggest that authentication of only said message routing network using the identifier included in the message provides authentication of the sender of the message.

Sandhu is not cited as disclosing or suggest any element of an independent claim and, therefore, is not discussed herein.

Thus, claims 1 and 15 recite features that are not disclosed or suggested in Bakshi, Zombek, Shiozawa, and Giroux, considered alone or in combination. Therefore, claims 1 and 15 are not obvious in view of Bakshi, Zombek, Shiozawa, and Giroux.

Claims 2-3, 5-8, 16, and 21-26 are dependent claims which, by virtue of their dependency, incorporate the features of the independent claims on which they are based. Therefore, claims 2-3, 5-8, 16, and 21-26 are not obvious for at least the reasons set forth above.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of claims 1-3, 5-8, 15-16, and 21-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, allowance of the claims at the earliest possible date is requested.

If prosecution of this application can be assisted by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number set forth below.

Applicant does not believe that any additional fees are required to facilitate the filing of this Amendment. However, if it is determined that such fees are due, please charge such additional fees to Deposit Account No. 504480 (Order No. ODVFP009A).

Respectfully submitted,

Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP

/Joseph M. Villeneuve/

Joseph M. Villeneuve
Reg. No. 37,460

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, California 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100